

Main analyses:

CMB group has 3 papers – 20 page paper on amalgamation alone PRD20,2782(1979) 2804 2839

See also Höhler `bible' and Koch & Pietarinen. NPA336,331(1980) Karlsruhe-Helsinki, Carnegie-Mellon-Berkeley, GWU/VT

Differ from previous in that resonance structure is not input [i.e. PWA and resonance extraction are separate steps.]

In the KH and CMB analyses, data are initially shifted to common energies/angles to determine the partial-wave amplitudes up to ambiguities.

Numerous dispersion relation constraints are imposed to hopefully choose a unique solution. Once consistent amplitudes are found, resonance info is extracted.

VT/GWU differs in fit strategy and choice of dispersion relation constraints.

Single-energy fits
πN Photoproduction
πN scattering



The GWU/VT approach differs in also parameterizing the global energy-dependence via a Chew-Mandelstam (CM) K-matrix .

The method was developed by Basdevant & Berger, and has also been applied to meson-meson, NN, and K⁺ p scattering.

ρπ scatteringJ.-L. Basdevant and E.L Berger, PRD19, 239 (1979).NN scatteringB.J. Edwards and G.H Thomas, PRD22, 2772 (1980).KN scatteringR.A. Arndt and L.D. Roper, PRD31, 2230 (1981).generating functionJ.H. Reid and N.N. Trofimenkoff, J. Math Phys 25, 3540 (1984).



AN INVESTIGATION OF THE LOW EQUATION AND THE CHEW-MANDELSTAM

EQUATIONS

Thesis by

Kenneth Geddes Wilson

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

California Institute of Technology

Pasadena, California

1961

`contact with the lattice'



In the GWU/VT approach, a *CM* K-matrix was used in the fit

- real data for πN elastic and $\pi N \rightarrow \eta N$ were fitted
- effective channels $\pi N \rightarrow \pi \Delta$, $\pi N \rightarrow \rho N$ accounted for remaining inelasticity

$$T^{-1} = K^{-1} - i\tilde{\rho}$$

= $(K^{-1} + \operatorname{Re} C) - (\operatorname{Re} C + i\tilde{\rho})$
= $\overline{K}^{-1} - C$,

where C is the CM function, fixed by Im C = ρ and a once subtracted DR. Compared to the usual K-matrix

$$K = \frac{1}{1 - \overline{K} [\operatorname{Re} C]} \overline{K}$$



Bonn-Gatchina partial wave analysis. Comparison of the K-matrix and D-matrix (N/D based) methods PWA 2012 12

In the present fits we calculate the elements of the B^{ij}_{α} using one subtraction taken at the channel threshold $M_{\alpha} = (m_{1\alpha} + m_{2\alpha})$:

$$B_{\alpha}^{ij}(s) = B_{\alpha}^{ij}(M_{\alpha}^2) + (s - M_{\alpha}^2) \int_{m_{\alpha}^2}^{\infty} \frac{ds'}{\pi} \frac{g_{\alpha}^{(R)i} \rho_{\alpha}(s', m_{1\alpha}, m_{2\alpha}) g_{\alpha}^{(L)j}}{(s' - s - i0)(s' - M_{\alpha}^2)}.$$

In this case the expression for elements of the \hat{B} matrix can be rewritten as:

$$B_{\alpha}^{ij}(s) = g_a^{(R)i} \left(b^{\alpha} + (s - M_{\alpha}^2) \int\limits_{m_a^2}^{\infty} \frac{ds'}{\pi} \frac{\rho_{\alpha}(s', m_{1\alpha}, m_{2\alpha})}{(s' - s - i0)(s' - M_{\alpha}^2)} \right) g_{\beta}^{(L)j} = g_a^{(R)i} B_{\alpha} g_{\beta}^{(L)j}$$

and D-matrix method equivalent to the K-matrix method with loop diagram with real part taken into account:

$$A = \hat{K}(I - \hat{B}\hat{K})^{-1} \qquad B_{\alpha\beta} = \delta_{\alpha\beta}B_{\alpha}$$

A. Sarantsev talk



Poles may appear in the usual K-matrix without explicit inclusion in the *CM* K-matrix.

Fits were done assuming a simple polynomial behavior for the CM K-matrix [except for the $\Delta(1232)$] i.e. no resonances were assumed.

Poles were found in the T-matrix corresponding to the dominant 4-star states (but not all those seen by KH and CMB).

Breit-Wigner states added 'by hand' to see if fit would show significant improvement (found candidates in S_{11} and F_{15} but did not reproduce the KH and CMB sets).







Compare GW (red/yellow) vs KH (green/blue)







N(1860) 5/2⁺

 $I(J^{P}) = \frac{1}{2}(\frac{5}{2}^{+})$ Status: **

OMITTED FROM SUMMARY TABLE

Before the 2012 *Review*, all the evidence for a $J^P = 5/2^+$ state with a mass above 1800 MeV was filed under a two-star N(2000). There is now some evidence from ANISOVICH 12A for two $5/2^+$ states in this region, so we have split the older data (according to mass) between two two-star $5/2^+$ states, an N(1860) and an N(2000).

N(1860) BREIT-WIGNER MASS

VALUE (MeV) 1820 to 19			TECN	COMMENT			
1860 + 120 - 60	ANISOVICH	12A	DPWA	Multichannel			
1817.7	ARNDT	06	DPWA	$\pi N \rightarrow \pi N, \eta N$			
1903 ± 87	MANLEY	92	IPWA	$\pi N \rightarrow \pi N \& N \pi \pi$			
$1882 \ \pm \ 10$	HOEHLER	79	IPWA	$\pi N \rightarrow \pi N$			
 We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. 							
1814	ARNDT	95	DPWA	$\pi N \rightarrow N \pi$			



New names and new states (mainly due to BoGa fits)

New headers are an attempt at disambiguation N(2000) 5/2⁺

 $I(J^P) = \frac{1}{2}(\frac{5}{2}^+)$ Status: **

OMITTED FROM SUMMARY TABLE

Before the 2012 *Review*, all the evidence for a $J^P = 5/2^+$ state with a mass above 1800 MeV was filed under a two-star N(2000). There is now some evidence from ANISOVICH 12A for two $5/2^+$ states in this region, so we have split the older data (according to mass) between two two-star $5/2^+$ states, an N(1860) and an N(2000).

N(2000) BREIT-WIGNER MASS

VALUE (MeV)	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT			
1950 to 2150 (≈ 2050) OUR ESTIMATE							
[1850 to 1950 MeV OUR 2011 ESTIMATE]							
2090 ± 120	ANISOVICH	12A	DPWA	Multichannel			
2025	AYED	76	IPWA	$\pi N \rightarrow \pi N$			
1970	¹ LANGBEIN	73	IPWA	$\pi N \rightarrow \Sigma K \text{ (sol. 2)}$			
2175	ALMEHED	72	IPWA	$\pi N \rightarrow \pi N$			
1930	DEANS	72	MPWA	$\gamma p \rightarrow \Lambda K \text{ (sol. D)}$			



Possible objection to GW/VT fit – parametrizing energy dependence results in 'smoothing'.

Exercise: add explicit poles to the CM K-matrix

- may result in more T-matrix poles
- will test the model-dependence of the πN amplitudes.
- more consistent approach compared to the addition of BW structures by hand.

 \mathcal{CM} K-matrix pole \rightarrow regular K-matrix pole \rightarrow T-matrix pole



Where did the added poles go?









Eigenphases

$$T = K (1 - iK)^{-1}.$$

The real symmetric K matrix is diagonalized by an orthogonal transformation, U as

$$K_D = U^T K U.$$

This matrix also diagonalizes the T matrix, and therefore the S matrix, defined as S = 1 + 2iT. Since S is a unitary matrix,

$$(S_D)_{ij} = U^T S U = \delta_{ij} e^{2i\delta_i}$$

where the δ_i are eigenphases. Using the relation between K and T matrices above, we have

$$(K_D)_{ij} = i(1 - S_D)(1 + S_D)^{-1} = \delta_{ij} \tan \delta_i.$$



C. Goebel, K. McVoy, PR164,1932(1967)

H. Weidenmuller, PLB24,441(1967)







D₁₃ (1520) [N(1520)3/2⁻]

In XP08 solution (*CM* poles) must have *at least* one 90 degree crossing

P₁₁(1440) [N(1440)1/2⁺]

D₁₃ (1520) [N(1520)3/2⁻]

Turn off pole/non-pole contributions

added poles replaced states originally produced by the polynomial CM K-matrix

Better to find these `missing' states in other reactions.